DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 549 JC 960 104

AUTHOR Sanders, Elena Y.
TITLE A Comprehensive System of Community Colleges in Ohio: To Be or Not To Be?
PUB DATE 22 Apr 95
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Graduate Student Seminar of the Council of Universities and Colleges (Minneapolis, MN, April 22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Policy; College Role; *Community Colleges; Comprehensive Programs; Educational History; *Educational Legislation; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; *Politics of Education; School Community Relationship; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges; Universities; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

After 40 years of efforts, the first bill authorizing the establishment of community colleges in the state of Ohio was finally adopted in June 1961. Before and after the passage of the act, attempts had been made to create a comprehensive community college system in Ohio, but all of them failed. A 1970 study by the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR), for example, found that a lack of coordination among universities, technical schools, and community colleges led to a duplication of efforts and recommended the creation of comprehensive community colleges to better serve their communities. Public and private four-year universities, however, were against the recommendation fearing negative effects on enrollments. In 1992, a task force was created to suggest ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the state's public higher education system, recommending restructuring the two-year campuses and again advocating a comprehensive community college system. The task force also found that the public were often confused about the services available at community colleges. In response, while not establishing comprehensive systems, the OBOR established service expectations for all two-year colleges and regional campuses. While these expectations represent a possible starting point, attempts to create a comprehensive community college system in Ohio have so far failed because of political pressure from influential interest groups, including private colleges, proponents of vocational and technical education, and state four-year universities. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 391 549

A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN OHIO: TO BE OR NOT TO BE?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Sanders

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Elena Y. Sanders

The University of Toledo

199 Needlewood Lane
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
(614) 577-1484
INTERNET: DSANDERS@CSI.COMPUSERVE.COM

Presented at the 1995 CUC Graduate Student Seminar

Minneapolis, MN

JC 960 104

Paper presented at the Annual Graduate Student Seminar Office of the Council of Universities and Colleges. (Minneapolis, MN, April 22, 1995)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN OHIO: TO BE OR NOT TO BE?

The community college is an intriguing institution within the system of higher education in the United States. Since the moment of its first appearance, the community college has had strong supporters and vigorous critics. The rapid expansion of community colleges throughout the U.S. in the post World War II period indicates that they found their own place in the system of higher education with their unique mission and students. The development of community colleges was not uniform throughout the different states. For example, California has a well developed a comprehensive system of community colleges. While North Dakota does not have even one community college (Vaughan, 1985).

In the state of Ohio the first publicly supported community college under the Ohio's community college act appeared in 1962. This happened even though the first interest in and demand for community college services appeared in the early twenties. It took more then forty years to pass the bill, that authorized the establishment of community colleges in the State of Ohio. This 1962 bill was not passed without a battle. Before and after the passage of the Act, many people struggled with creating a comprehensive system of community colleges in Ohio. Between 1950 and 1995 several attempts were made, but all of them failed. The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to analyze the various failed attempts at developing a comprehensive community college system for the State of Ohio. What was attempted, when, and why did the efforts fail were the main research questions of this study.

The time period for this study is 1950 to the present. The important roles of public and private four-year colleges and universities, the Ohio Board of Regents,

and various governors will be discussed in terms of their relation to legislation creating community colleges. The development of Ohio's extensive postsecondary vocational education system will only be discussed as it relates to the development (or the lack thereof) of a comprehensive community college system to serve adults in the state of Ohio. While the purpose of this paper is to analyze the reasons for the various failed attempts, it may also provide some insight regarding the conditions that need to be in place in order to create a comprehensive system of community colleges in the state of Ohio in the future.

ATTEMPTS TO CREATE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN 1950-1970

In the fifties and early sixties the educational system in Ohio experienced a dramatical increase in enrollment. The elementary and secondary schools had to expand their facilities in order to accommodate so called "baby boomers" the children of the World War II veterans. New buildings for elementary and high schools were built all over the state. That was true not only for the State of Ohio but for the United States as well. In 1960 there were 6 state publicly supported universities, 3 municipal universities, and 22 university branches and academic centers in Ohio. In the view of William Coulter, fourth chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, at that time projections for anticipated enrollment of baby boomers in the area of higher education made officials think about the means of accommodating students willing to pursue a higher education (Coulter, 1994).

In Cleveland, for example, as a result of a community effort, the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education was formed in 1951 (Lerner, 1994). Its primary concern was to provide a public four-year college for the Greater Cleveland area. A special commission was appointed to study the need for a university or community college in Cuyahoga County. This commission was headed by Dr. John Millett from Columbia University. Dr. Millett subsequently served as President of Miami

University and later as the first Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, which was formed in 1963 with the help of the Governor James Rhodes. Another association, The Cleveland Foundation, was also actively involved in this study and provided some of the operational funds for this commission (Lerner, 1994: 6). The report of the Cleveland Commission on higher education stated that there was a significant need for two-year postsecondary program in the Cleveland area (Lerner, 1994).

John Dale Russell was invited by the Ohio College Association to direct a survey on how Ohio was to handle the baby boom in 1955. Russell's report indicated that Ohio had a sufficient economic base to support community colleges (Russell, 1955 in Williams, 1960). In his report, four possible plans for establishing community colleges were proposed:

1. Organize community colleges as an upper-bound extension of the local public school system, adding the 13th and 14th grades to the high schools.
2. Organize community colleges as local institutions, each with its own controlling board but not directly under the control of the local school authorities.
3. Organize community colleges as independent state institutions with their own boards, appointed by the state authority.
4. Organize community colleges as branches of existing universities.

State universities were opposed to the proposal to create community colleges under the State Board of Education, because they objected to any credit or degrees being granted by a system of secondary education (Lerner, 1994).

It is important to outline here that there have been and there are now groups which are both for and against creating community colleges in Ohio. These interested groups include state universities, private colleges, vocational and technical schools, and the proponents of the community college movement. Each of these constituencies has its vested interest in developing or slowing down the

expansion of community colleges in Ohio. Since the end of 1950's the battle over the expansion of community colleges has continued unabated.

The first attempts to establish community colleges in Ohio occurred in 1927, 1929, 1931, 1949, 1951, and 1953 (Colon, 1992). All of these failed to be enacted into Law. The next attempt to pass a bill authorizing the establishment of community colleges occurred in 1959. The 1959 bill actually passed both houses with majority vote. It permitted local two-year institutions to be funded by school boards, municipalities, or counties and permitted the new institutions to deliver technical courses as well as general studies. Governor DiSalle vetoed the bill (Lerner, 1994) on the basis of "inadequate provisions" for financial support. In Max Lerner's opinion Governor DiSalle vetoed this bill because several university presidents were opposed to it. As he states, the governor has been visited by some of the presidents and was encouraged to veto the bill. State universities in Lerner's view were concerned with the competition over money and didn't want to share funding with new colleges (Lerner, 1994).

In September of 1958 the U.S. Congress passed the National Defense Education Act which provided significant funding to postsecondary education, especially as it relates to science, mathematics and engineering. At that time groups interested in community colleges worked together with activists of vocational and technical education. The director of the Division of Vocational Education in the Ohio State Department of Education was Byrl Shoemaker. Shoemaker had a tremendous influence on the development of statewide technical institutes in Ohio according to a number of observers (Lerner, 1994 and Coulter, 1994). At that time it was important to pass a bill which would authorize the establishment of two-year institutions to provide postsecondary education. It was in the interests of the advocates of the vocational education to support the idea of two-year colleges, in that through these institutions they would receive the advantage of granting

associate degrees to their students. They could not do that being under the control of the Ohio State Board of Education.

The first technical school was started in 1958 in Barberton, Ohio. As Max Lerner (1994) indicated in his as yet unpublished book, one of the interesting studies on the vocational-technical education was done in 1959 at Ohio State University by Carl J. Schaefer. He made a study to determine a Master Plan for Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Education for the state of Ohio. Schaefer actually identified twenty economic areas in the state and after analyzing the high school graduates in each of these geographic areas, recommended that the ultimate goal would be to have at least two postsecondary vocational-technical institutes in each economic area by 1967 (Lerner, 1994 and Williams, 1960).

Another statewide study for comprehensive community colleges in Ohio was conducted at Ohio State University by Glen D. Williams as his doctoral dissertation in 1960. Williams determined 36 geographical districts in Ohio on the basis of population distribution as well as the physical remoteness of the chosen center from the boundaries of the districts. The criteria also included estimation of the county property tax valuations. In his study Williams proposed that community colleges be financed by a combination of state and local taxes as well as student tuitions (Williams, 1960).

In order to explore the many diverse views on a statewide system of two-year colleges, the Ohio Legislature with the assistance of Governor DiSalle created an Interim Commission on Education Beyond High School in 1959 (OBOR, 1988, Lerner, 1994). This Commission spent a great deal of time conducting hearings throughout the state, and made recommendations in favor of community colleges in its final report. Senator Ross Pepple, who was a strong supporter of university branches prepared a minority report (Lerner, 1994). In this report Pepple stated that

the state university branches can provide better education and at the least possible cost to Ohio. Some of his arguments were:

> that the branches use high school buildings and facilities which would otherwise cost hundreds of millions of dollars;
>
> the overhead cost is small because it is handled by the administrators of the parent universities;
>
> expensive laboratory equipment can be shared by moving it from one campus to another (Lerner, 1994).

Some of these arguments are still valid today, which is why they are presented in a more extensive manner here. Pepple argued that at the branch universities all work is fully accredited the day the branch is established, as opposed to community college which could wait years to attain accreditation. He also emphasized that the prestige of the state universities permitted it to hire competent professional instructors more readily. Pepple pointed out that the state universities has had a century of experience at managing, equipping and operating colleges, whereas many counties did not have a single resident who had any experience along this line. In the view of this author, many of these arguments sound arrogant and to some extent humiliating. This is one of the ways in which the attitude of inferior position of community colleges forms in the minds of people.

The first bill authorizing the establishing of community colleges was finally adopted in June of 1961. The new Community College Act became Section 3354 of the Ohio Revised Code (Lerner, 1994). This bill created a special Community College Board, which existed for one year. Cuyahoga and Lorain County Community Colleges were the first institutions formed under the Ohio's Community College Act. Cuyahoga Community College was awarded a charter to operate in December of 1962 and Lorain County Community College got its in July of 1963 (Lerner, 1994). By 1975 there were 5 community colleges: Lorain, Cuyahoga, Lakeland, Rio Grande

and Sinclair with a total enrollment of 42,389 students, which constituted 10.6% of the total fall 1974 enrollment (OBOR, 1975).

During the same time this legislation was passed, the proponents of technical and vocational education lost a great deal of enthusiasm in using community colleges to deliver technical education (Coulter, 1994). The vocational education advocates believed that community colleges would be too "academic" and would not provide good technical-vocational education. Because of this, Dr. Shoemaker, who had strong support from the governor, started to establish joint vocational schools (JVS) throughout the state that could serve both the high schools and adult population (Lerner, 1994).

In 1962 James A. Rhodes was elected to the first of four four-year terms as Governor of Ohio. Rhodes was not particularly interested in having a separate community college board, instead he wanted to create a state Board of Regents and incorporate all coordinative aspects of higher education with this board. The legislation creating the Ohio Board of Regents was passed in 1963, and as mentioned before its first chancellor was John Millett, ex-president of the Miami University.

In 1963, a bill authorizing the establishment of technical schools under the coordinating role of the OBOR was also passed. This bill recognized technical schools as institutions of higher education and gave then a power to award associate degrees. Governor J. Rhodes strongly supported vocational and technical education expansion arguing that "general education leads to general unemployment" (Coulter, 1994). By 1975 there were 17 technical schools and 3 state general and technical schools with a total enrollment of 18,098 students. That constituted 4.5% of the total enrollment pool in the public higher education institutions of Ohio (OBOR, 1975).

Thus, by the mid 1960s a system of two-year institutions, which provided postsecondary education to people in Ohio had been established. It was a diverse

system with university branches, community colleges, and vocational-technical schools. All of these institutions were under the coordinating role of the OBOR.

A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES: ATTEMPT IN 1970

In 1970 the OBOR invited Arthur D. Little, Inc. to determine how higher educational opportunities might best be extended in Ohio to provide even greater service to the population. The director of this study was Raymond J. Young, who was a known authority in the area of two-year institutions. Young conducted 55 studies on establishing individual community colleges and state-wide studies in several other states as well. His work included the five studies that led to the creation of Cuyahoga, Lorain, Lakeland, Sinclair and Rio Grande community colleges.

In this study the group found considerable disagreement, misunderstanding and differences of opinion existed in Ohio regarding the missions of technical schools, university branches and community colleges (Young, 1970). The study stated that the lack of coordination in planning , development and administration of three types of two-year institutions led toward undesirable competition for students among them and to expensive duplication of facilities, programs and staff. The study also revealed that Ohio as an industrialized state had a great demand for post-high school educational opportunities. The study argued for the creation of a system of comprehensive two-year institutions in the state of Ohio, which would best serve the needs of the communities where they would be located. After carefully considering the general social, economic and political conditions in Ohio the group recommended:

to declare a moratorium on establishment of any new university branches or academic centers;

to enact legislation to design Regional Community Technical College service districts throughout the state. The group proposed the plan to do that.

to create statures which would prohibit any two-year college from becoming a four-year institution;

to authorize OBOR to establish an office of Vice Chancellor for two-year college education;

the law should define the major functions of comprehensive community oriented two-year colleges as: provisions of two-year college transfer programs, terminal vocational and technical programs, developmental and remedial education, education appropriate to needs, interests, and activities of residents for the purpose of enhancing the quality of life in the district; provision of student personal services including counseling and guidance (Young, 1970).

The 1970 study also concluded that the integrated single multipurpose institution approach was the best for meeting Ohio's needs. The Young study recommended to make efforts to create a single community college in the co-located universities and technical schools (Young, 1970).

In the view of this author, the Young study was very much on target. Unfortunately, public and private four-year institutions were opposed to the development of community colleges in Ohio. All of them considered a well established and coordinated system of two-year institutions as a threat to their own enrollments. In a personal interview, Dr. Young assured the author that he knows that such a system is not a competitor to four-year institutions. On the other hand, such a system actually enhances enrollment in these institutions. Community colleges give an opportunity to pursue an education to many nontraditional students, who for various reasons would not go to four-year institutions. However, these students would not mind attending to a two-year institution if one was

available. Many times these students feel comfortable in pursuing their educations further, once they found that they like it and they can do it (Vaughan, 1985).

Public and private four year colleges and universities had been and are very strong in Ohio (Young, 1994). Ohio has nearly 70 privately controlled institutions. Some of them are small and residential in nature, with 200-300 students and very high tuition. For these institutions, the establishment of community colleges was perceived to be a great threat to their own survival. Public universities on the other hand did not wish to share federal and state money with community colleges. Public universities also wanted to keep their two-year branches, because it allowed them to ask for additional funding, in spite of the fact that they did not invest a lot of their institutional funds in their branches.

THE ROLE OF THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

In this part of the paper, the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) actions and steps toward developing community college expansion will be discussed. The OBOR does not have governing role for higher education in Ohio. The OBOR does has a coordinating function. In general the OBOR has favored the establishment of a comprehensive system of community colleges (Coulter, 1994).

In the Master Plan of 1971, the OBOR struggled at length with the question of the most desirable structure of two-year colleges. In 1970, there were 4 community colleges, 15 technical institutions, and 19 university branches (OBOR, 1971: 1). There were also another four or five places in the state where a permanent two-year campus was planned or needed. As was noted in the annual report of 1971, the OBOR proposal to have separate and independent state community and technical colleges was subject to vigorous criticism on the part of various groups. The Master Plan for 1971 called for a gradual and voluntary approach toward the realization of this objective. The OBOR tried to propose the creation of a comprehensive system

of community colleges with every subsequent Master Plan (Coulter, 1994). While the OBOR has always favored a state-wide community college system, actions were never taken because of the strong opposition from private and public four-year colleges and universities (Coulter, 1994).

By the order of the Governor and the General Assembly, the special Citizens' Task Force on Higher Education was created in 1974. Legislators, representatives of the general public, students, faculty, administrators and trustees from public, independent and proprietary institutions conducted a statewide survey of opinion. This task force studied the most pressing public policy issues confronting higher education in Ohio. The task force concluded that all Ohioans must be given the opportunity to pursue education beyond high school. The task force identified three paramount objectives to be accomplished: 1. equal access to higher learning for all; 2. life-long learning opportunities for all ages ; and 3. emphasis on excellence in higher education through planning and adequate financing (OBOR, 1974).

When considering the issue of access to higher education, this task force concluded that "geographical access is not an issue in Ohio." As a result, the task force recommended that the General Assembly should not establish any additional permanent two or four-year undergraduate campuses, or expand existing two-year institutions into four-year institutions. The Task Force concluded that on the basis of geography and current and projected enrollment trends, Ohio's system was complete: "Ohio has successfully accommodated enrollment growth," the report concluded (OBOR, 1974).

Still, the community college issue was not resolved. The OBOR directed the staff to review the work of two-year campuses, to evaluate what was being done and what should be done, and to outline procedures for implementing a state-wide plan (OBOR, 1975). In March of 1975 the OBOR

staff presented its first formal report on that charge. The report was submitted after an extensive consultative process, not as a master plan but as a step in working toward meeting the needs of Ohio for two-year collegiate offerings. The report contained: 1. goals for Ohio's two-year college system that have been accepted by the OBOR and the state; 2. the facilities and programs existing to help those goals; 3. some problems to be faced; and 4. some guidelines for further planning and actions to take (OBOR, 1975).

The OBOR report of the 1975-1977 biennium recommended that the two plus two concept be designed and planned as part of the 1976 Master Plan. This concept was to foster improved access and cooperation among the various sectors of postsecondary community and specifically to provide upward mobility in the technical education fields. Agreements were to be worked out on a program by program basis between consenting colleges and universities to enable an associate degree graduate to transfer without loss of credit (OBOR, 1977).

Since that time until the early nineties, no further rational attempts were made to create a comprehensive system of community colleges in Ohio. In Chancellor Norton's (1971-1978) as well as Chancellor Moulton's (1979-1983) personal reports, community colleges were mentioned generally together with other two-year branch institutions. It was generally acknowledged that two-year institutions were reaching "large, growing, previously unserved market, on a live-at-home basis" (OBOR, 1978, 1983). The role of two-year institutions in delivering vocational-technical, general and developmental education was also cited. As was noted in the Moulton's report (1983), a new initiative was started involving the State Department of Education and OBOR to develop better articulation. In 1981, 15 members of a special Advisory Committee on Articulation began to work on smoothing transition of students from high school to college.

A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES: ATTEMPTS IN 1990s

A new attempt to change the situation was initiated in 1992. The Task Force "Managing for the Future" was appointed by OBOR at the request of Governor Voinovich to examine higher education's operations and to suggest ways in which public higher education in Ohio could become more effective and efficient (OBOR, 1992). The Task Force found that the existing kaleidoscope of two-year institutions was confusing to the public. Community colleges, state community colleges, technical colleges and branches of state universities created a general state of misunderstanding over their purposes and missions. The 1992 report of Ohio Board of Regents, "Securing for the Future of Higher Education in Ohio" concluded that "Ohio cannot afford to continue this dispararity in service" (OBOR, 1992: 19). The Managing for the Future Task Force recommended restructuring the two-year campuses, and advocated a comprehensive community college system for Ohio. Some of the recommendations included:

- all technical college and university branches should to be converted to community colleges;
- where a technical college and a branch shared a campus (there were 7 such locations throughout Ohio), the two institutions would be consolidated;
- all community college to be supported by local property tax of at least one mill to supplement support received from the state (OBOR, 1992).

The public view on community colleges was quite different from that of the 1992 Task Force. The Ohio Board of Regents was impressed by the depth of commitment to their local institutions that many people expressed. The public hearings revealed that often the public was unaware of the full range of service being performed by community colleges. The OBOR stated that "improving the access of Ohioans to higher education is of vital importance to the future of this state and its people" (OBOR, 1992: 21). Therefore, the Board set service expectations

for the two-year campuses. It also agreed with the critics who suggested that the concept of two-year colleges would not be based on an organizational principle, but rather upon the principal of service. It also determined that it would be helpful to adopt a single term for all two-year institutions to strengthen public understanding of the consistency of services provided. The goal of any two-year institution must be full service at an affordable price the report suggested.

The Board proposed following a set of service expectations for all two-year colleges and regional campuses to meet, regardless of their individual organization or administrative structure:

1. a range of career/technical programming;
2. developmental education;
3. partnerships with industry, business, government for retraining of the workforce;
4. noncredit continuing education opportunities;
5. college transfer programs;
6. linkages with high schools;
7. student access provided according to a convenient schedule and program quality provided at an affordable price;
8. student fees kept as low as possible;
9. a high level of community involvement in the decision-making process (OBOR, 1992).

In April 1993, Chancellor Elaine Hairston created an Advisory Committee on Two-Year Service Expectations for Two-Year Colleges and Regional Campuses. The Committee identified a set of indicators by which performance on the nine service expectations might be evaluated (OBOR, 1993: 4). The performance measures for service expectations were further elaborated in a June 1994 report. (OBOR, 1994). Consistent with this approach that all two-year campuses be evaluated on the basis of service expectations. This procedure was intended to bring about a systematization in services provided by two-year institutions. In the long run,

according to OBOR, the idea of the comprehensive community college will be imprinted in the mind of the public.

As of March 1995, there are 13 public four-year universities, 23 university branches, 11 community colleges and 12 technical colleges (OBOR, 1992). The enrollment to these institutions is broken down as follows: universities - 269,941 students, which constitutes 62.1% of the total student fall 1990 enrollment; universities branches - 40,122 students, which constitutes 9.2% of total students enrollment; community colleges - 81,422 students, which is 18.7%; technical colleges - 42,921 students, which is 9.9% of the total students fall 1990 enrollment (OBOR, 1991).

INTEREST GROUP POLITICS AND THE FAILURE TO DEVELOP A SYSTEM

In Ohio several attempts to create a comprehensive system of community colleges failed because of the political pressure of few key influential and interested groups. One of these groups represents the interests of the private colleges. Raymond J. Young particularly emphasized the influence of this group on educational policy making in Ohio. And as he suggested, this group played the main role in the failure to pass the plan of establishing community colleges districts in 1970 (Young, 1994).

Another group consists of the proponents of vocational and technical education. This group was particularly strong in the early sixties. Byrl Shoemaker was an influential figure in promoting technical and vocational education in Ohio. He supported the idea of community college in 1962, when the first legislation victory was held and the bill to establish community colleges was passed. But then he and his supporters changed their attitudes toward the community college idea. They thought that by providing general (transfer) education community colleges

would concentrate mainly on this goal and not pay sufficient attention to promoting quality technical and vocational education.

Yet another group, very influential throughout this period has been the state four-year universities. Starting in the 1940s, state universities began opening their two-year branches in many towns across Ohio. In the early stage, these campuses shared physical facilities with the local high schools or technical schools. The branches mainly provided general transfer education. There were and are many reasons why these branches are criticized. One key reason is that they do not provide service to the community where they are located (OBOR, 1992). In general, state universities are opposed to the idea of community colleges, because of the proposition to turn two-year university campuses to community colleges. The universities do not want to loose their branches, because they fear of loosing additional funds, which are available for them otherwise. Another reasons is that universities charge higher tuition in their branches then community colleges do (OBOR, 1992 and Coulter, 1994). This money goes not to the development of the branch campuses but to the needs of the main campuses. Secondly, universities ask for more funding from the state and federal government. Having the branches allows state universities to attain a larger share of the state budget. Also communities where branches of the state universities are located like to have the status of a university located in their town. They are proud of being affiliated with the state universities. Citizens of the communities where university branches are located do not want to change this situation, and in the early 1990s joined the universities in an effort to keep their branch two-year branches (OBOR, 1992).

DISCUSSION

In this paper the role of private institutions, state universities, the Ohio Board of Regents and technical and vocational schools in the development of community colleges in Ohio was discussed. This study requires further elaboration

on the influences of business, state officials, and local educators on the community college movement in Ohio.

This paper prompted some insights into what conditions should be in Ohio to create a comprehensive system of community colleges. Several different factors are present that can aid in such an arrangement. Max Lerner suggested that the governor can make an ultimate decision to create a system of community colleges in Ohio. He suggested that a governor should do that either when he is at the first year in an office (hoping that the opposing groups would forget and forgive him for making this decision before the next reelection period) or when he is in the last year in office, if the governor chooses not to run again.

William Coulter suggested that something beyond anybody's power has to happen in the society to shake the balance which has existed for 30 years. As the baby boom influenced the fast growth and development of secondary and higher education, something similar could change the status quo which exists today between private, public four-years institutions and two-year colleges in Ohio. Coulter noted also the tendency of converting technical and vocational schools into comprehensive community colleges. He said that at present, taking technical schools one by one might be the most effective way to promote the idea of community colleges. The results of this slow process are enlightening. Every year there are two-year technical institutions which have been converted to community colleges. Examples include: Northwest Technical College which became Northwest Community College in 1994 and Southern State General and Technical College became Southern State Community College. Another good example would be the Columbus Technical Institute, which became Columbus State Community College.

William Coulter remembered that a half dozen private colleges were initially very much opposed to this transfer. A special study was attempted by Ann Moore to assess the need for community college in the area of Greater Columbus. In spite of

the fact that in Columbus at least 8 four-year colleges and university are located (the Ohio State University, Franklin University, Pontifical College Josephinum, Eliss College, Capital University, Columbus College of Art and Design, Ohio Institute of Technology, Ohio Dominican College, and Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary) the need for a community college was enormous. The OBOR and William Coulter in particular served as a liaison to private institutions and helped reassure them that their enrollments would not suffer because of the community colleges. A special interest group was created and met regularly before and after the Columbus Technical Institute became Columbus State Community College. Gradually, it became obvious that such a transfer was not a threat to private institutions, because they draw their enrollments out of the top one fourth of high school graduates, while community colleges get their enrollments from the middle and lower groups of high school graduates.

Some of the tendencies appeared to be similar. In Ohio, several state-wide studies on the need for community colleges were conducted. Unfortunately, new studies did not give any credit to those previously done. The 1960 Glen Williams and 1970 Raymond Young studies were not given any attention and credit in the 1992 "Managing for the Future" Task Force study. The Williams's and Young's studies are comprehensive and wonderfully done. In my opinion they still are relevant and current.

Further study on this topic is necessary to create a full picture of how the community college movement was developed in Ohio. The important question to explore is the role the federal policies and politics has had on developing community colleges in Ohio. Can there be a connection between 1980s federal student aid cut backs and the lack of attempts to promote the idea of comprehensive system of community colleges in Ohio at that time? Was there a correlation between rapidly expanding federal funds through the Vocational Education Act of

1963 and the sudden switch to opposition to comprehensive community colleges on the part of vocational education leaders? An effort should be made to study the individual cases of establishing community colleges in Ohio. More attention should be given to the roles of key people and groups in this effort. The roles of business, local communities, state officials and the chamber of commerce should be explored also.

The author believes that it is possible to develop a comprehensive system of community colleges in the State of Ohio. The service expectations developed in 1992 by the OBOR are the first step in this direction. Governor with the strong position and one that willing to develop such a system would help to that enormously. The provisions to provide state universities with additional funding in exchange to their permission of converting branch campuses to community colleges, would put state universities on the side of community colleges advocates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Citizens' Task Force on Higher Education. State of Ohio. (1974). Columbus: OBOR.

Colon, D. (1992). The history of Public Community College in Ohio. The University of Toledo.

Coulter, W. (February 17,1995). Personal Interview. In Columbus.

Lerner, M. (1994). Unpublished Book. Columbus: Author.

Lerner, M. (February 17, 1995). Personal Interview. In Columbus.

OBOR (1967). Ohio Board of Regents Capital Improvement Plan for State Assisted Institutions of Higher Education. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1969). Ohio Basic Data Series. Higher Education. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1975a). Annual Report. Fiscal Year 1975. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1975b). Ohio Basic Data Series. Higher Education. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1977). Report of the 1975-1977 Biennium. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1983). Chancellor's Report 1979-1983. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1988). Toward the Year 2000. Higher Education in Transition. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1991). Ohio Public Higher Education. Basic Data Series. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1992a). The Report of the Managing for the Future Task Force. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1992b). Securing the Future of Higher Education in Ohio. A Report of the Ohio Board of Regents. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1993). Report of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Service Expectations for Two-Year Colleges and Regional Campuses. Columbus: OBOR.

OBOR (1994). Performance Measure for Service Expectation for Ohio's Two-Year Colleges and Regional Campuses. Columbus: OBOR.

Vaughan, G. B. (1985). The Community College in America. Washington, DC: AACJC.

Williams, G. (1960). The Community College in Ohio. Ohio State University.

Young, R. J. (1970). A Proposed Plan for Meeting Ohio's Need for Two-Year Post-High School Education. Columbus: Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Young, R. J. (February 23,1995). Telephone Interview.